



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,760	07/31/2001	Erez Michael	Q64010	2812

7590 06/13/2007  
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER
----------

SHELEHEDA, JAMES R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/13/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/917,760	MICHAEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	James Sheleheda	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some    \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, see page 12-16, filed 5/14/07, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 23, 41, 46 and 47 under Remillard have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hendricks. (5,990,927).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 4-12, 14, 15, 17-21, 22-30, 32, 33 and 35-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Remillard (5,461,667) (of record) in view of Hendricks et al. (Hendricks) (5,990,927).

As to claim 1, Remillard discloses a communication system for a television system (Fig. 1) including:

an interactive response system (20) in communication with a television system (50, Fig. 1) being contained within a set-top box (see Figs. 1 and 2; column 5, lines 27-44) that is in communication with the television (column 6, lines 7-13) and that converts

Art Unit: 2623

a received digital television signal into television content (column 2, lines 44-60, column 3, lines 7-9, column 5, lines 21-26 and column 6, lines 7-13), and being arranged to accept an input from a user (user input to select a feature; Fig. 3; column 6, lines 29-42) in response to an output signal produced by the television (Fig. 3; column 6, lines 7-13 and 29-34),

the interactive response system then being operative to trigger a communication between the user and a remote third party (Figs. 1 and 4; column 7, lines 12-14 and lines 35-48),

wherein the communication is dependent upon the output signal produced by the television (column 6, lines 29-34 and column 7, lines 2-17).

While Remillard discloses wherein the system may communicate with a cable television provider (column 7, lines 41-53) to enable ordering of television programming (column 7, lines 41-53), he fails to explicitly recite wherein the set-top box will convert a received digital television signal into television content.

In an analogous art, Hendricks discloses a digital television system (Fig. 1) which utilizing a television set top box for providing interactive access to external content providers (Fig. 18; column 36, line 21-58) which will convert a received digital television signal into television content (received digital video converted to NTSC for television output; Fig. 4; column 14, lines 37-58) for the typical benefit of providing an consumers with a user friendly means to handle television programming and interactive functionality within a single set top box (column 1, line 40-column 3, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Remillard's system to include specifically include wherein the set-top box will convert a received digital television signal into television content, as taught by Hendricks, so as to allow the user to receive and view their television programming and provide consumer with a user friendly means to handle television programming and interactive functionality within a single set top box.

As to claim 4, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the interactive response system is downloaded into the set top box upon first use of the input by a user (See Remillard at column 5, lines 44-56); and

wherein the output signal is produced by a remote control (52) to the set top box (See Remillard at column 6, lines 29-42) and from the set top box to a headend (See Remillard at Fig. 1; column 6, lines 29-42 and column 7, lines 35-48).

As to claim 5, Remillard and Hendricks disclose a processing system (30) in communication with the interactive response system (See Remillard at Fig. 1; column 4, lines 36-54), wherein the interactive response system triggers a communication by communicating details of the output signal to the processing system (See Remillard at column 7, lines 24-28), the processing system being arranged to determine the communication to be triggered in dependence on the output signal and to initiate the communication (See Remillard at Fig. 1; column 9, lines 4-12).

As to claim 6, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the processing system is arranged to determine the mode of communication in dependence on the output signal (See Remillard at column 9, lines 4-11).

As to claim 7, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the processing system is arranged to determine the content of the communication in dependence on the output signal (See Remillard at column 9, lines 4-11).

As to claim 8, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the interactive response system communicates with the processing system via a communication network (See Remillard at Fig. 1).

As to claim 9, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the communication network is one of a public service telephone network and a cellular network (See Remillard at column 4, lines 41-45).

As to claim 10, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the communication network is a cable network (See Remillard at column 4, lines 42-45).

As to claim 11, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the processing system is in a location remote to the user (See Remillard at Fig. 1) and is arranged to server a plurality of users (See Remillard at column 4, lines 36-55).

As to claim 12, Remillard and Hendricks disclose the output signal represents an email (See Remillard at Fig. 3; column 6, lines 43-64).

As to claim 14, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the remote third party is a telephone associated with the sender of the output signal (See Remillard at column 9, lines 4-15), and wherein the interactive response system is operative to trigger a telephone call between a telephone associated with the user and the telephone associated with the sender of the output signal (See Remillard at column 9, lines 4-15).

As to claim 15, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the remote third party is a voicemail system associated with a sender of the output signal (See Remillard at column 9, lines 4-15), and wherein the interactive response system is operative to trigger a telephone call between a telephone associated with the user and the voicemail system (See Remillard at Fig. 6B; column 9, lines 4-15).

As to claim 17, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the output signal represents an information page (See Remillard at Fig. 3).

As to claim 18, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the interactive response system is operative to trigger a telephone call between a telephone

Art Unit: 2623

associated with the user and the telephone associated with the sender of the output signal (See Remillard at column 9, lines 4-15).

As to claim 19, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the interactive response system is operative to transmit a request to the remote third party (See Remillard at column 9, lines 28-51), the request comprising information on a content of the output signal and information on the user (See Remillard at column 9, lines 28-53), wherein the remote third party uses the information to communicate with the user about the content (See Remillard at column 9, lines 28-53 and column 6, lines 58-64).

As to claim 20, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the request is communicated electronically to a computer system associated with the output signal (See Remillard at column 9, lines 28-53).

As to claim 22, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the remote third party communicates with the user via email (See Remillard at column 6, lines 58-64).

As to claim 23, Remillard discloses an interactive response method for a digital television system (Fig. 1) comprising:

accepting an input from a user in response to an output signal produced by a television of the digital television system (user input to select a displayed feature; Fig. 3; column 6, lines 29-42), the input being accepted at a set-top box (see Figs. 1 and 2;



Art Unit: 2623

column 5, lines 27-44) that is arranged to be in communication with the television (column 6, lines 7-13), and

triggering a communication between the user and a remote third party (Figs. 1 and 4; column 7, lines 12-14 and lines 35-48), wherein the communication is dependent upon the output signal produced by the television (column 6, lines 29-34 and column 7, lines 2-17).

While Remillard discloses wherein the system may communicate with a cable television provider (column 7, lines 41-53) to enable ordering of television programming (column 7, lines 41-53), he fails to explicitly recite wherein the set-top box will convert a received digital television signal into television content.

In an analogous art, Hendricks discloses a digital television system (Fig. 1) which utilizing a television set top box for providing interactive access to external content providers (Fig. 18; column 36, line 21-58) which will convert a received digital television signal into television content (received digital video converted to NTSC for television output; Fig. 4; column 14, lines 37-58) for the typical benefit of providing an consumers with a user friendly means to handle television programming and interactive functionality within a single set top box (column 1, line 40-column 3, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Remillard's system to include specifically include wherein the set-top box will convert a received digital television signal into television content, as taught by Hendricks, so as to allow the user to receive and view their

Art Unit: 2623

television programming and provide consumer with a user friendly means to handle television programming and interactive functionality within a single set top box.

As to claim 41, Remillard discloses a computer readable medium (Fig. 2) on which is stored a computer program of instructions (column 5, lines 28-55) for a set top box for an interactive system for a digital television system (Fig. 1) comprising, in combination:

means for enabling the set top box to accept an input from a user (IR detector, 132; column 6, lines 24-29) in response to an output signal produced by a television of the digital television system (user input to select a displayed feature; Fig. 3; column 6, lines 29-42), the set top box being in communication with the television (column 6, lines 7-13), and

means for enabling the set top box to trigger (CPU, 100) a communication between the user and a remote third party (Figs. 1 and 4; column 7, lines 12-14 and lines 25-48), wherein the communication is dependent upon the output signal produced by the television (column 6, lines 29-34 and column 7, lines 2-17).

While Remillard discloses wherein the system may communicate with a cable television provider (column 7, lines 41-53) to enable ordering of television programming (column 7, lines 41-53), he fails to explicitly recite wherein the set-top box will convert a received digital television signal into television content.

In an analogous art, Hendricks discloses a digital television system (Fig. 1) which utilizing a television set top box for providing interactive access to external content

providers (Fig. 18; column 36, line 21-58) which will convert a received digital television signal into television content (received digital video converted to NTSC for television output; Fig. 4; column 14, lines 37-58) for the typical benefit of providing an consumers with a user friendly means to handle television programming and interactive functionality within a single set top box (column 1, line 40-column 3, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Remillard's system to include specifically include wherein the set-top box will convert a received digital television signal into television content, as taught by Hendricks, so as to allow the user to receive and view their television programming and provide consumer with a user friendly means to handle television programming and interactive functionality within a single set top box.

As to claim 42, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the means for enabling the set top box to trigger a communication comprises:

means for enabling the computer to communicate details of the output signal to a processing system (Fig. 1; column 4, lines 36-54 and column 7, lines 24-28);

means for enabling the processing system to determine the communication to be triggered in dependence on the signal (column 9, lines 4-12); and

means for enabling the processing system to instigate the communication (column 9, lines 4-12).

As to claim 43, Remillard and Hendricks disclose means for enabling the set top box to download a remainder of the computer program upon first use of the input by a user (column 5, lines 57-63 and column 8, lines 35-37).

As to claim 45, Remillard and Hendricks disclose a program storage device readable by a machine and encoding a program of instructions for executing the method steps of claim 23 (column 5, lines 28-56).

As to claim 46, Remillard discloses a set top box adapted to provide an interactive response system (Fig. 2) comprising:

- a processor (CPU, 100), and

- a memory (100 and 102) including software instructions adapted to enable the computer system to perform operations (column 5, lines 28-56) comprising:

- accepting an input from a user in response to an output signal produced by a television of the digital television system (user input to select a displayed feature; Fig. 3; column 6, lines 29-42), the set top box being in communication with the television (column 6, lines 7-13), and

- triggering a communication between the user and a remote third party (Figs. 1 and 4; column 7, lines 12-14 and lines 35-48), wherein the communication is dependent upon the output signal produced by the television (column 6, lines 29-34 and column 7, lines 2-17).

While Remillard discloses wherein the system may communicate with a cable television provider (column 7, lines 41-53) to enable ordering of television programming (column 7, lines 41-53), he fails to explicitly recite wherein the set-top box will convert a received digital television signal into television content.

In an analogous art, Hendricks discloses a digital television system (Fig. 1) which utilizing a television set top box for providing interactive access to external content providers (Fig. 18; column 36, line 21-58) which will convert a received digital television signal into television content (received digital video converted to NTSC for television output; Fig. 4; column 14, lines 37-58) for the typical benefit of providing an consumers with a user friendly means to handle television programming and interactive functionality within a single set top box (column 1, line 40-column 3, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Remillard's system to include specifically include wherein the set-top box will convert a received digital television signal into television content, as taught by Hendricks, so as to allow the user to receive and view their television programming and provide consumer with a user friendly means to handle television programming and interactive functionality within a single set top box.

As to claim 47, Remillard discloses a computer program product for enabling a set top box to provide an interactive response system for a digital television system comprising software instructions for enabling the set top box to perform predetermined

operations (column 5, lines 28-56), and a computer readable medium bearing the software instructions (Fig. 2), the predetermined instructions including:

accepting an input from a user in response to an output signal produced by a television of the digital television system (user input to select a displayed feature; Fig. 3; column 6, lines 29-42), the set top box being in communication with the television (column 6, lines 7-13) and being operable to receive digital television services (column 3, lines 7-9, column 5, lines 21-26 and column 9, lines 41-61); and

triggering a communication between the user and a remote third party (Figs. 1 and 4; column 7, lines 12-14 and lines 35-48), wherein the communication is dependent upon the output signal produced by the television (column 6, lines 29-34 and column 7, lines 2-17).

While Remillard discloses wherein the system may communicate with a cable television provider (column 7, lines 41-53) to enable ordering of television programming (column 7, lines 41-53), they fail to explicitly recite wherein the set-top box will convert a received digital television signal into television content.

In an analogous art, Hendricks discloses a digital television system (Fig. 1) which utilizing a television set top box for providing interactive access to external content providers (Fig. 18; column 36, line 21-58) which will convert a received digital television signal into television content (received digital video converted to NTSC for television output; Fig. 4; column 14, lines 37-58) for the typical benefit of providing an consumers with a user friendly means to handle television programming and interactive functionality within a single set top box (column 1, line 40-column 3, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Remillard's system to include specifically include wherein the set-top box will convert a received digital television signal into television content, as taught by Hendricks, so as to allow the user to receive and view their television programming and provide consumer with a user friendly means to handle television programming and interactive functionality within a single set top box.

As to claim 2, while Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the communication system is a set top box, he fails to specifically disclose wherein the set top box is integrated in a digital television.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to integrate the hardware and functionality into a digital television, which then reduces the overall hardware required by the user, for the typical benefit of providing a simpler, more user friendly system, requiring less components and eliminating the need to interconnect plural devices.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Remillard's system to include wherein the set top box is integrated in a digital television for the typical benefit of providing a simpler, more user friendly system, requiring less components and eliminating the need to interconnect plural devices.

As to claim 3, while Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the set top box communicates with a television provider (column 3, lines 7-9 and column 9, lines 41-53) and

wherein the interactive response system triggers the communication via a digital network, they fail to specifically disclose wherein the communication is via a digital television network.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant for a television network to provide both upstream and downstream communication across a digital television network, as opposed to utilizing a separate network such as a telephone system, for the typical benefit of providing a simpler system, wherein a single cable connection with a set top box would provide two-way communication, and thus eliminate the need to interconnect with a plurality of different networks, such as through a separate wire to a telephone jack.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Remillard and Hendrick's system to include wherein the communication is via a digital television network for the typical benefit of providing a simpler system, wherein a single cable connection with a set top box would provide two-way communication, and thus eliminate the need to interconnect with a plurality of different networks, such as through a separate wire to a telephone jack.

As to claim 24, while Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the set top box communicates with a television provider (column 3, lines 7-9 and column 9, lines 41-53)



Art Unit: 2623

and wherein the step of accepting comprises receiving the input at a set top box arranged to communicate with the digital television system (see Figs. 1 and 2; column 5, lines 27-44, column 6, lines 29-42 and column 9, lines 41-53), they fail to specifically disclose wherein the communication is via a digital television network.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant for a television network to provide both upstream and downstream communication across a digital television network, as opposed to utilizing a separate network such as a telephone system, for the typical benefit of providing a simpler system, wherein a single cable connection with a set top box would provide two-way communication, and thus eliminate the need to interconnect with a plurality of different networks, such as through a separate wire to a telephone jack.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Remillard and Hendrick's system to include wherein the communication is via a digital television network for the typical benefit of providing a simpler system, wherein a single cable connection with a set top box would provide two-way communication, and thus eliminate the need to interconnect with a plurality of different networks, such as through a separate wire to a telephone jack.

As to claim 25, Remillard and Hendricks disclose communicating details of the output signal from the set top box to a processing system (Fig. 1; column 4, lines 36-54 and column 7, lines 24-28);

determining at the processing system the communication to be triggered in dependence on the output signal (Fig. 1; column 9, lines 4-12); and  
initiating the communication (Fig. 1; column 9, lines 4-12).

As to claim 26, Remillard and Hendricks disclose determining a type of communication in dependence on the output signal (column 9, lines 4-11).

As to claim 27, Remillard and Hendricks disclose determining content of the communication in dependence on the output signal (column 9, lines 4-11).

As to claim 28, Remillard and Hendricks disclose communicating via one of a communication network (Fig. 1), a public service telephone network (column 4, lines 41-45) and a cable network (column 4, lines 42-45).

As to claim 29, Remillard and Hendricks disclose downloading computer program code corresponding to the interactive response method into the set top box upon first use of the input by a user (column 5, lines 44-56).

As to claim 30, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the output signal represents an email (Fig. 3; column 6, lines 43-64).

As to claim 32, Remillard and Hendricks disclose triggering a telephone call between a telephone associated with the user and the telephone associated with the sender of the output signal (column 9, lines 4-15).

As to claim 33, Remillard and Hendricks disclose triggering a telephone call between a telephone associated with the user and a voicemail system (Fig. 6B; column 9, lines 4-15).

As to claim 35, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the output signal represents an information page (Fig. 3).

As to claim 36, Remillard and Hendricks disclose triggering a telephone call between a telephone associated with the user and a telephone system associated with the sender of the output signal (column 9, lines 4-15).

As to claim 37, Remillard and Hendricks disclose generating a request (column 9, lines 28-51), the request comprising information on a content of the output signal and information on the user (column 9, lines 28-53), and transmitting the request to the remote third party (column 9, lines 28-51), wherein the remote third party uses the information to communicate with the user about the content (column 9, lines 28-53 and column 6, lines 58-64).

As to claim 38, Remillard and Hendricks disclose communicating the request electronically to a computer system associated with the output signal (column 9, lines 28-53).

As to claim 40, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the remote third party communicates with the user via email (column 6, lines 58-64).

As to claims 21 and 39, while Remillard and Hendricks disclose transmitting a request to a computer system associated with the output signal (column 9, lines 28-51) and the use of email (column 6, lines 29-64), they fail to specifically disclose wherein the request is an email.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to transmit requests utilizing the ubiquitous email format, such as when requesting additional information concerning an item or to order a product or service, for the typical benefits of taking advantage of a widely accepted and utilized communication format to allow a user to make a request.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Remillard and Hendricks' system to include wherein the request is an email for the typical benefits of taking advantage of a widely accepted and utilized communication format to allow a user to make a request.

As to claim 44, Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the output signal represents an email (Fig. 3; column 6, lines 43-64).

4. Claims 13 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Remillard and Hendricks as applied to claims 12 and 30 and further in view of Dugan et al. (Dugan) (6,330,079) (of record).

As to claims 13 and 31, while Remillard and Hendricks disclose wherein the remote third party is a voice recording system arranged to record a voice message as an electronic file (column 9, lines 4-11), wherein the interactive response system is operative to trigger a telephone call between a telephone associated with the user and a third party (column 9, lines 4-11), the communication system being arranged to transmit the communication to the sender of the output signal (column 9, lines 4-26) and email messages (column 6, lines 29-64), they fail to specifically disclose triggering a call from the user to record an electronic file and transmitting the electronic file as an attachment to an email.

In an analogous art, Dugan discloses multi-format transmission platform (column 3, line 63-column 4, line 19) which includes speech to text software (column 16, lines 41-56) to allow the conversion of voice messages to any other format (including email; column 16, lines 41-56) and transmitting the email message (column 16, lines 41-56) for the typical benefit of allowing messages to be converted into any format the subscriber desires (column 16, lines 53-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Remillard and Hendricks' system to include triggering a call from the user to record an electronic file and transmitting the electronic file as an attachment to an email, as taught by Dugan, for the typical benefit of allowing messages to be converted into any format the subscriber desires.

5. Claims 16 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Remillard and Hendricks as applied to claims 1 and 23 above, and further in view of Merwin et al. (Merwin) (6,731,725) (of record).

As to claims 16 and 34, while Remillard and Hendricks disclose a voice recording system arranged to record voice messages as electronic files (column 9, lines 6-20), the interactive response system being operative to trigger a telephone call between a telephone associated with the user and the voice recording system (column 9, lines 6-20), they fail to specifically wherein the output signal represents a future date and/or time, recording a voice message as an electronic file, the communication system associating the electronic file with the future date and/or time and being arranged to call a telephone associated with the user on the date and/or time and play the electronic file to the user.

In an analogous art, Merwin discloses a communication system (Fig. 1) wherein a user will call a voice recording system (column 5, lines 29-31) to record a voice message as an electronic file (column 5, lines 56-60) and wherein the user will specify a future date and time for the electronic file to be output (column 5, lines 48-52) to enable

the system to call the user on the specified date and time (column 5, line 63-column 6, line 2) and play the electronic file to the user (column 6, lines 3-9) for the typical benefit of allowing users to automatically provide future reminder messages to themselves (column 3, line 50-column 4, lines 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Remillard and Hendricks' system to include wherein the output signal represents a future date and/or time, recording a voice message as an electronic file, the communication system associating the electronic file with the future date and/or time and being arranged to call a telephone associated with the user on the date and/or time and play the electronic file to the user, as taught by Merwin, for the typical benefit of allowing users to automatically provide future reminder messages to themselves.

### ***Conclusion***

6. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

### **Certificate of Mailing**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents

Art Unit: 2623

P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Registration Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**Certificate of Transmission**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. ( ) \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Registration Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Sheleheda whose telephone number is (571) 272-7357. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James Sheleheda  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2623

JS

  
SCOTT E. BELIVEAU  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER